

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/600,063	OLSTAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shew-Fen Lin	2166	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Shew-Fen Lin. (3) Scott A. Stinebruner.  
 (2) Mohammad Ali. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 October 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tavares et al., US Patent, 5,307,487.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives explained the invention and prior art.

Examiner/Applicant proposed some ammendments (for example, incorporating claim 13 to claim 5 and amending all the independent claims to incorporate subject matter of claim 13 ) to clarify the feature of the invention and to overcome the existing prior art rejection. After receiving the official ammendment, further search will be conducted and another office action follows.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



MOHAMMAD ALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

**Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

## WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

BRUCE TITTEL  
 DAVID S. STALLARD  
 J. ROBERT CHAMBERS  
 GREGORY J. LUNN  
 KURT L. GROSSMAN  
 CLEMENT H. LUKEN, JR.  
 THOMAS A. BURGER  
 GREGORY F. AHRENS  
 WAYNE L. JACOBS  
 KURT A. SUMMER  
 KEVIN G. ROCNEY  
 KEITH R. HAUPP  
 THEODORE R. REMAKLUS  
 THOMAS W. HUMPHREY  
 SCOTT A. STINEBRUNER  
 DAVID H. BRINKMAN  
 BEVERLY A. LYMAN, PH.D.  
 KRISTI L. DAVIDSON  
 KATHRYN E. SMITH  
 P. ANDREW BLATT, PH.D.  
 DAVID E. JEFFERIES

2700 CAREW TOWER  
 441 VINE STREET  
**CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-2917**  
 TELEPHONE: 513-241-2324  
 FACSIMILE: 513-241-6234  
 WEBSITE: www.whepatent.com

PATENT, TRADEMARK, COPYRIGHT  
 AND UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW  
 AND RELATED LITIGATION

EDMUND P. WOOD 1923-1968  
 TRUMAN A. HERRON 1935-1976  
 EDWARD B. EVANS 1936-1971

JOSEPH R. JORDAN  
 C. RICHARD EBY  
 WILLIAM R. ALLEN, Ph.D.  
 JOHN PAUL DAVIS  
 DOUGLAS A. SCHOLER  
 BRETT A. SCHATZ  
 DAVID W. DORTON  
 SARAH OTTE GRAHAR  
 STEVEN W. BENINTENDI, Ph.D.  
 RANDALL S. JACKSON, Jr.  
 CARL J. BRAUCH

OF COUNSEL  
 JOHN D. POFFENBERGER  
 DAVID J. JOSEPHIC  
 DONALD F. FREI  
 THOMAS W. FLYNN  
 J. DWIGHT POFFENBERGER, JR.  
 BRADLEY D. BECK

October 13, 2006

### FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

To: Examiner Shew Fen Lin  
 Art Unit 2166  
 Mail Stop AMENDMENT  
 Commissioner for Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22213-1450

Fax: 571-273-2672

Enclosures:

Fax Cover Sheet containing Certificate of  
 Facsimile Transmission (1 page)  
 Interview Agenda (1 page)

From: Scott A. Stinebruner  
 Reg. No. 38,323

Re: U.S. Patent Application  
 Application No. 10/600,063  
 Filed: June 20, 2003  
 Applicant: Chad Allen Olstad et al.  
 Art Unit: 2166  
 Confirmation No.: 5930  
 Our Ref: IBM/241


Pages: 2 (including cover sheet)

### MESSAGE/COMMENTS Interview Agenda attached.

#### CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence and the enclosures noted herein (2 total pages, including cover sheet) are being transmitted via facsimile transmission to Examiner Shew Fen Lin, Art Unit 2166, Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 at 571-273-2672 on October 13, 2006.

  
 Judith L. Volk

  
 Date

The information in this facsimile message is ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, WORK PRODUCT and/or CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this message is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via mail. Thank you.  
 If transmission is interrupted or of poor quality, please notify us immediately by calling (513) 241-2324 and ask for the sender's assistant. OUR FAX NUMBER IS (513) 241-6234.

**Proposed Interview Agenda**  
S/N 10/600,063

**I. Discussion of 103 rejections**

- A. Independent claims focus on a lock that is implemented as a single indicator with at least three distinct states
- B. Tavares discloses two separate counters
- C. Gupta discloses a counter and a flag, but even if considered individually, counter is for a different purpose (# of cached copies) and flag is binary - i.e., two states.

**II. Discussion of potential clarifying claim amendments**